



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,625	04/27/2001	Martin Morris	WIDC-019/00US	2405

7590 09/20/2006

Christopher C. Winslade
McAndrews, Held & Malloy
500 W. Madison Street
Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

EXAMINER

LEE, CHI HO ANDREW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2616

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/844,625

Applicant(s)

MORRIS, MARTIN

Examiner

Andrew Lee

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re Claim 1, line 9, adapted is optional language and lacks positive recitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 16, 17, 24, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greaves et al U.S. Patent Number 7,072,056.

Re Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 16, 17, 24, 25, fig. 1 teaches 112 (a device communication device) includes a module 28 for communication in accordance to first protocol and 114 (electronic system) includes a module 38 for communication in accordance to second protocol; 40 translation unit for translating between the protocols (See fig. 3) wherein the module 38 does not need to be aware to the first protocol because of the translation unit 40. Greaves fails to explicitly teach the wireless link. Greave teaches that the communication protocol includes, among other protocols, IEEE

Art Unit: 2616

LAN. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to support wireless LAN application to support mobility. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled to modify the communication link to include wireless interface.

5. Claims 3-10, 12-15, 17-23, 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greaves et al U.S. Patent Number 7,072,056 in view of Bork U.S. Patent Number 6,255,800.

Re Claims 3, 13, 18, refer to Claim 1, Greaves fails to explicitly teach that the device includes a USB protocol. However Bork teaches 70 is a PC coupled to the USB port, wherein the Bluetooth USB Firmware is connected to 70 for translating information for device 50. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to include the translation function of Bork into the translating unit of Greave to be adaptive to different communication protocols.

Re Claims 4, 19, 26, refer to Claim 1, Bluetooth LM & LC (a peripheral detection & connection module).

Re Claims 6, 21, refer to Claim 1, wherein Bluetooth operates TDM, hence, it is inherent that the fig. 19 includes a Bluetooth MUX/DEMUX arrangement to connected to the Bluetooth/USB firmware.

Re Claims 8, 9, 23, refer to Claim 1, USB operates in TDM bus, hence, it is inherent that the USB Device Controller to include a multiplexing and demultiplexing arrangement, USB Device Controller also inherently includes USB protocol stack to be connected to the BluetoothUSB Firmware, USB device controller inherently includes a configuration database to interpret plurality PC commands from plurality of host drivers.

Re Claims 14, 15, refer to Claim 1, 46 is coupled to 50 mobile wherein 50 includes Service/Function of other devices. Hence, it is inherent for the translator in 46 to recognize the service/function of other devices to protocol conversion wherein the predefined routines are device specific in the Bluetooth USB firmware.

Re Claims 5, 20, 27, refer to Claim 4, wherein the 64, 66, 68 is the Bluetooth protocol stack.

Re Claims 7, 22, 28, the USB device controller coupled to the inherently includes the USB protocol stack.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-3130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AI
9/15/06

ANDREW C. LEE
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

